



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,173	10/23/2003	Yen-Fu Chen	AUS920030664US1	8343
45993	7590	01/05/2010		
IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ P. O. BOX 23324 OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123			EXAMINER SHIH, HAOSHIAN	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/05/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/692,173	Applicant(s) CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner HAOSHIAN SHIH	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20091231A</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1- 18 are pending in this application and have been examined in response to application amendment filed on 10/22/2009.
2. The previously applied rejection under USC 112 1st and 2nd are hereby withdrawn in view of applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claim 1 recites the limitation "a clipboard" in lines 10-11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner suggests "**the** clipboard".
5. Claim 16 recites the limitations "the concatenated information **items**" in line 8, and "the multiple selected information elements" in line 9. There is insufficient antecedent basis for limitations in the claim.
6. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected similarly as set forth in claim 16.
7. Claims 1-15 are rejected similarly because of their dependency to claims 16-18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2173

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Apperley (Apperley, "Breaking the copy/paste cycle: the stretchable selection tool") in view of Blish et al. (Blish, US 6,177,939 B1).

10. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 16, Apperley discloses a computer-implemented method comprising: providing a copier configured to allow a user to designate a destination point or area in a first computer resource, and to select in a second user interface to a second computer resource multiple information element in the second computer resources (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.2; a destination area/sink field and source area/tank fields are visually connected allowing for a destination first, source second copy/paste operation of multiple information elements. For example, "64 - 9 - 366 0121" in the highlighted area);

Responsive to the user selection, automatically [copy] the selected information elements into a single transfer buffer (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.1, sect. 3.3, par.7, lines 7-9); information elements are copied to a clipboard as the user drags the stretchable selection tool across information items 64 - 9 - 366 0212); and

Automatically transferring the information items from the transfer buffer, to the destination point or area of one or more information elements (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.1; information items 64 - 9 - 366 0212 on the right, are identified and copied to the "Fax" field on the left).

Apperley does not specifically disclose concatenating the multiple selected information elements and transferring the concatenated information items to the destination point.

In the same field of endeavor, Blish discloses concatenating the multiple selected information elements and transferring the concatenated information items to the destination point (col.1, lines 55-66, col.3, lines 41-46; information elements are selected from multiple locations are collected/copied/appended/concatenated to a clipboard memory and pasted to a destination location).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Apperley and Blish before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the destination first, source second copy/paste interface taught by Apperley to include multiple source information selection taught by Blish with the motivation being to make multiple information selecting and pasting more efficient (Blish, col.1, lines 30-45).

11. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 17, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 16 above.

12. As to **INDEPENDENT** claim 18, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 16 above.

13. Claims 1, 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Apperley in view of Blish and in further view of Stern et al. (Stern, US 6,807,668 B2).

14. As to claim 1, Apperley discloses wherein the providing of a copier comprises providing a destination-first, source-second element copier configured to allow a user in a first user interface to a first computer resource to designate a destination point or area in the first computer resource, and to subsequently select in a second user interface to a second computer resource two or more information elements in the second computer resource (fig.3; sect. 3.1, par.2; a destination area/sink field and source area/tank fields are visually connected allowing for a destination first, source second copy/paste operation of multiple information elements);
Blish discloses Wherein the transfer buffer comprises a clipboard in memory (col.1, lines 60-63; "clipboard).

Wherein the concatenating further comprises, subsequent to the user selections, automatically copying the selected information elements into a clipboard in memory col.1, lines 55-66, col.3, lines 41-46; information elements are selected from multiple locations are collected/copied/appended/concatenated to a clipboard memory and pasted to a destination location).

Apperley and Blish do not disclose wherein the automatic transferring further comprises, upon attempt to automatically transfer the information items from the clipboard in memory, intercepting the transfer to the destination point or area of one or more information elements; and the method further comprising: performing a

Art Unit: 2173

compatibility check for each intercepted information element with the destination computer resource by consulting one or more user-configurable compatibility rules to classify elements as incompatible or compatible; for each incompatible element, performing a compatibility handling action as defined by one or more conversion rules; and for each compatible element, allowing transfer of the unmodified compatible element to the destination.

In the same field of endeavor, Stern discloses wherein the automatic transferring further comprises, upon attempt to automatically transfer the information items from the clipboard in memory, intercepting the transfer to the destination point or area of one or more information elements(col.7, lines 25-30; a drag manager checks the capabilities of the information elements before issuing a paste command);

the method further comprising: performing a compatibility check for each intercepted information element with the destination computer resource by consulting one or more user-configurable compatibility rules to classify elements as incompatible or compatible (col.45, lines 6-9, lines 31-34; “GetFlavorFlags” determines compatibility, “GetFlavorData” determines data type, user uses the data returned from the functions described above to configure compatibility rules);

for each incompatible element, performing a compatibility handling action as defined by one or more conversion rules (col.9, lines 40-57; “translation manager”); and

for each compatible element, allowing transfer of the unmodified compatible element to the destination (col.7, lines 60-64; col.9, lines 36-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Apperley and Blish and the teaching of Stern before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the destination first, source second copy/paste interface taught by Apperley and Blish to include an element compatibility manager taught by Stern with the motivation being to copy potentially incompatible information elements to a destination area (Stern, col.8, lines 15-3; col.9, lines 49-55).

15. As to claim 6, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

16. As to claim 11, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 1 above.

17. Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Apperley, Blish, Stern, Tomm et al. (Tomm, US 6,560,608 B1) and in view of Tsuji et al. (Tsuji, US 5,586,025).

18. As to claim 2, Apperley, Blish and Stern do not disclose invoking a rule management user interface responsive to finding no existing compatibility rule for an element to be transferred; allowing, via the rule management user interface, a user action selected from the list of creating a new compatibility rule, deleting a compatibility rule, and modifying a compatibility rule.

Art Unit: 2173

In the same field of processing data, Tomm discloses a system for selecting rules to process data. Tomm further teaches invoking a rule management interface (“rule editor”) responsive to finding no existing rule for matching for an element to be transferred (fig.6; “630”, “640”, “650”); Tomm also teaches allowing, via the rule management user interface, a user action to create a new rule (see col.5, lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Apperley, Blish and Stern and the teaching of Tomm before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for transferring content taught by Apperley, Blish and Stern to include an interface for adding new rules taught by Tomm with the motivation being to enhance the usefulness of Apperley and Stern’s system since the added new rules “are available for subsequent [compatibility checking] operations” (see Tomm, col.7, lines 61-62).

Tomm does not disclose deleting a compatibility rule, and modifying a compatibility rule.

In the same field of endeavor, Tsuji discloses a rule management user interface (fig.1, “17”), a user action selected from the list of creating a new rule (col.5, lines 65-66, “registration of a new rule”), deleting a rule (col.6, lines 11-12 “delete the rule base”), and modifying a rule (col.5, lines 67- col.6, lines 2, “changing a stored rule”).

Art Unit: 2173

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Apperley, Blish, Stern and Tomm, and the teaching of Tsuji before him at the time the invention was made, to modify system for transferring content taught by Apperley, Blish, Stern and Tomm to include the rule deletion and modification taught by Tsuji with the motivation being to provide a customizable user interface for rules manipulation.

19. As to claim 3, Apperley, Blish and Stern do not disclose invoking a rule management user interface responsive to finding no existing conversion rule for an element to be transferred; and allowing, via the rule management user interface, a user action selected from the list of creating a new conversion rule, deleting a conversion rule, and modifying a conversion rule.

In the same field of processing data, Tomm discloses a system for selecting rules to process data. Tomm further teaches invoking a rule management interface ("rule editor") responsive to finding no existing rule for matching for an element to be transferred (fig.6; "630", "640", "650"); Tomm also teaches allowing, via the rule management user interface, a user action to create a new rule (see col.5, lines 35-41).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Apperley, Blish and Stern and the teaching of Tomm before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the system for transferring content taught by Apperley and Stern to include an interface for adding new rules taught by Tomm with the motivation being to enhance the usefulness of Apperley, Blish and Stern's system since

Art Unit: 2173

the added new rules “are available for subsequent [compatibility checking] operations” (see Tomm, col.7, lines 61-62).

Tomm does not disclose deleting a compatibility rule, and modifying a conversion rule.

In the same field of endeavor, Tsuji discloses a rule management user interface (fig.1, “17”), a user action selected from the list of creating a new rule (col.5, lines 65-66, “registration of a new rule”), deleting a rule (col.6, lines 11-12 “delete the rule base”), and modifying a rule (col.5, lines 67- col.6, lines 2, “changing a stored rule”).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Apperley, Blish, Stern and Tomm, and the teaching of Tsuji before him at the time the invention was made, to modify system for transferring content taught by Apperley, Blish, Stern and Tomm to include the rule deletion and modification taught by Tsuji with the motivation being to provide a customizable user interface for rules manipulation.

20. As to claim 4, Stern discloses creating and modifying a conversion rule which specifies performing an action selected from a group comprising converting a text element from one format to another format, converting a graphic image element from one format to another format, converting a video clip element from one format to another format, converting an audio clip element from one format to another format, converting animated image element from one format to another format, isolating an

Art Unit: 2173

element, isolating an element and transferring an annotation to the destination, isolating an element and transferring a hyperlinked annotation to the destination (col.65, lines 4-8; each compatible format (col.7, lines 26-30 defines flavors as different data types, it is consist with the definition of data format) is listed via the translation manager (col.9, lines 49-54))

21. As to claim 5, Stern discloses performing a compatibility handling action comprises performing an action selected from the list of converting a text element from one format to another format, converting a graphic image element from one format to another format, converting a video clip element from one format to another format, converting an audio clip element from one format to another format, converting animated image element from one format to another format isolating an element, isolating an element and transferring an annotation to the destination, isolating an element and transferring a hyperlinked annotation to the destination (col.65, lines 4-8; each compatible format, (col.7, lines 26-30 defines flavors as different data types, it is consist with the definition of data format) is listed via the translation manager (col.9, lines 49-54)).

22. As to claim 7, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 2 above.

23. As to claim 8, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.

Art Unit: 2173

- 24. As to claim 9, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 4 above.
- 25. As to claim 10, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 5 above.
- 26. As to claim 13, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 3 above.
- 27. As to claim 14, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 4 above.
- 28. As to claim 15, see rationale addressed in the rejection of claim 5 above.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 16-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAOSHIAN SHIH whose telephone number is (571)270-1257. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 0730-1700.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kieu Vu can be reached on (571) 272-4057. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2173

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tadesse Hailu/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173

HSS